DeFarm

Research note • RQ-015

Staged Tokenization of Agricultural Assets

A Lifecycle Model for Real-World Assets with Biological Maturation

Gabriel Berlitz Rondon
DeFarm

April 2026

Abstract. Tokenization frameworks designed for financial instruments assume that the underlying asset is discrete, stable, and immediately verifiable. Agricultural real-world assets violate each of those assumptions: they mature over time, their value is path-dependent, and verification requires continuous observation rather than a single moment of issuance. This note proposes a *staged tokenization* model in which token issuance proceeds in multiple phases tied to attestable lifecycle checkpoints. We define a five-phase reference lifecycle (origin, maturation, attestation, release, settlement), specify how oracle responsibility and token supply evolve across phases, and discuss trade-offs in granularity, reversibility, and cost. The model is asset-agnostic within agriculture and works on account-based or object-based smart-contract platforms. It consolidates design directions the author has explored in prior work, including the *DeFarm Value Chain* Soroban prototype (2025).

Scope. This note addresses the technical foundations of staged tokenization for biologically maturing assets. Applications in specific regulatory regimes, fiscal instruments, or compensation schemes (such as payments for environmental services, state-level tax redistribution, or sovereign digital instruments) are complementary problem domains that build on, but are not addressed by, the model presented here.

1 Introduction

A recurring design mistake in agricultural tokenization is the implicit assumption that the asset exists in a single, immediately verifiable state at the moment of issuance. The canonical template — a fungible token minted one-to-one against an attested quantity of a commodity — was imported from financial instrument design, where the underlying exists completely at the moment it is tokenized. Agricultural assets are not like that. A calf is not a steer. A coffee blossom is not a green bean. A soybean field in November is not the same asset it becomes in April. Between those states, value is generated, degraded, or destroyed by processes that are only partially observable and entirely non-instantaneous.

This gap matters for three kinds of stakeholders. Producers absorb cash-flow risk because tokenization only rewards completion, not the intermediate value they actually created. Financiers price paper as if it were a bearer instrument, pricing in risk premiums that reflect the uncertainty of the lifecycle rather than the asset itself. Verifiers sit outside the issuance contract, adding cost without enjoying the economic participation that would align their incentives. A tokenization model that issues in one shot cannot address any of these; the problem is not in the metadata or the oracle, it is in the temporal topology of the issuance itself.

This note develops a framework in which issuance is distributed across the asset lifecycle, token supply grows monotonically with attested maturation, and oracle responsibility is decomposed across phase-specific committees. We are not proposing a new monetary instrument and we deliberately avoid any discussion of fiscal or compensation architectures built on top of tokens; those are downstream. The object here is the token lifecycle itself.

2 A Five-Phase Lifecycle

We define a reference lifecycle with five phases. The phases are not specific to any animal or crop; they describe the generic trajectory of a biologically maturing asset from the moment it is identified as economic object to the moment its economic value is settled.

2.1 Phase 1: Origin

The asset enters the system. This phase binds a unique identifier (farm, plot, lot, animal, batch) to an off-chain observation set: declared species or cultivar, geolocation, initial conditions, responsible party, and timestamp. The on-chain artifact is not yet a fungible claim. It is an attestation of existence.

2.2 Phase 2: Maturation

The asset grows, matures, or accumulates value over time. This phase is characterized by *continuous* observation rather than events: satellite imagery, weight measurements, climate exposure, input records, sanitation events. On-chain, the artifact remains an evolving attestation set tied to the identifier from Phase 1. No tradable unit has been minted yet.

2.3 Phase 3: Attestation

At defined checkpoints — annual audit, slaughter-age verification, harvest inspection, sanitary clearance — one or more authorized observers sign a statement certifying that the asset has reached a specific state. Each attestation produces a *partial mint*: a fractional claim against the eventual economic value, proportional to the attested progress. Multiple attestations are expected per asset, and the supply of claim tokens grows monotonically with validated maturation.

2.4 Phase 4: Release

The asset enters a state in which its economic potential can be realized (market-ready, harvestable, sellable, transferable). This phase merges the aggregated partial claims from Phase 3 into a *release token* that represents the full and current claim on the asset's value at the moment of release. Partial claims can be redeemed, traded, or rolled forward into the release token, depending on the policy of the issuance contract.

2.5 Phase 5: Settlement

The asset is sold, transferred, consumed, or otherwise exits the system. The release token is burned against the settlement proof (sale invoice, logistics document, export clearance), and any remaining partial claims are resolved against the settlement price. Economic surplus or deficit relative to the sum of partial mints is distributed according to contract.

Phase	Primary artifact	Supply delta	Oracle role
Origin	Identity attestation	0	Identity committee
Maturation	Continuous observation set	0	Passive sensors
Attestation	Partial claims (fractional mints)	$+\Delta_i$ per checkpoint	Authorized observer
Release	Release token (aggregated claim)	Aggregates prior partials	Release committee
Settlement	Burn against settlement proof	$-\Sigma\Delta_i$	Settlement oracle

3 Oracle Responsibility Across Phases

A recurring failure in single-shot tokenization is overloading a single oracle with end-to-end responsibility. The staged model decomposes oracle duties phase by phase, with distinct accountability and distinct signing authority. Four oracle roles emerge.

Identity oracles bind physical identifiers to on-chain records. Their inputs are registration documents, geolocation pins, and visual or genetic markers. Their output is a durable identity attestation that is mutable only through a formal re-registration procedure.

Passive observation oracles feed the maturation phase without producing signed attestations. Satellite imagery aggregators, weather feeds, and automated weighbridges fall here. Their output is raw data or lightly processed summaries; they do not sign claims of asset progression.

Attestation oracles perform the legally and economically significant act of certifying progression in Phase 3. They are typically accredited professionals or institutions (veterinarians, agronomists, auditors) operating under a signing authority scheme. Each of their signatures produces a partial mint. Their risk and reward are intrinsically tied to the correctness of their attestations — a point we return to below.

Settlement oracles bind the final burn of the release token to off-chain evidence of exchange. This role is often contracted to the same infrastructure that clears the physical transaction (export terminals, certified trading venues, cooperative settlement systems).

Decoupling these roles solves two related problems. First, it allows the attestation committee to be small, accountable, and redundancy-checked, while leaving the maturation-phase data pipeline open and cheap. Second, it allows each oracle type to be governed on its own timescale: identity is rare, maturation is continuous, attestation is event-driven, settlement is terminal.

4 Token Supply Progression

Let V be the eventual settlement value of an asset, unknown until Phase 5. During maturation, the settlement value can be estimated via models V_t that evolve with observations. At each attestation i in Phase 3, an amount Δ_i is minted against the asset's identifier, where Δ_i is bounded above by the attested fraction of progress multiplied by the most recent conservative valuation $V_{t_i}^{low}$.

Three design principles govern the mint:

1. **Monotonicity.** Supply never decreases during Phases 1–4. Once minted, a partial claim may be redeemed, transferred, or reclassified, but cannot be administratively rescinded without a formal re-attestation procedure.
2. **Conservatism.** Each Δ_i uses a conservative valuation, not an optimistic one. The total of partial mints at Phase 4 is expected to be strictly less than the actual settlement value, creating a positive settlement surplus that incentivizes honest completion rather than early-stage extraction.
3. **Phase-gating.** No Δ_i can be minted unless the prior phase's attestation is present on-chain. This enforces lifecycle integrity at the contract level and prevents jumping from Phase 1 directly to Phase 4.

The settlement surplus $V - \Sigma\Delta_i$ is a key design lever. Its distribution across producer, attestation oracle committee, and release token holder determines whether the system incentivizes early attestation (if oracles capture part of the surplus) or later attestation (if producers do).

5 Trade-offs and Open Questions

5.1 Granularity vs. cost

Finer attestation cadence reduces producer cash-flow risk but multiplies the operational cost of oracle committees and on-chain writes. Coarser cadence is cheaper but reintroduces the cash-flow problem that staged tokenization was designed to solve. The appropriate cadence is asset-class dependent and should be governed by the contract parameters, not hard-coded.

5.2 Reversibility and dispute

Monotonic supply conflicts with the reality that attestations can be wrong. The model handles this through *reclassification* rather than burn: a disputed partial mint is marked as contested on-chain and its holder is barred from aggregating it into the Phase 4 release token until the dispute is resolved. The token itself is not destroyed; it sits in a suspended state. This preserves accounting integrity while allowing error correction.

5.3 Oracle liability

Attestation oracles assume economic risk they did not face in single-shot models, where they signed once and were not exposed to subsequent failures. Staged tokenization requires that oracles stake collateral proportional to the cumulative value they have attested, slashed in the event of fraud or negligence proven through a dispute procedure. This binds oracle incentive to asset outcome and is the main source of the model's trust properties.

5.4 Composability with existing financial instruments

Phase 3 partial claims are naturally compatible with receivable-type instruments that exist in multiple jurisdictions (warehouse receipts, rural produce certificates, agricultural bills). The model is designed to sit underneath such instruments, providing the granular attestation substrate they already require but do not currently get. Whether the partial claims themselves are legally transferable independently of the instrument is jurisdiction-specific and out of scope here.

6 Discussion

The staged model is not a proposal for a new token standard. It describes a design discipline that existing smart-contract platforms can implement today. On account-based platforms (Stellar, Ethereum), Phase 3 partial claims can be modeled as distinct asset issuances sharing a compound identifier, with the release token as a pool-backed derived asset. On object-based platforms (Sui, Aptos), each partial claim can be an object whose lifecycle is directly trackable.

A practical question is whether the model can be retrofitted to existing single-shot tokenization projects. In principle yes: the existing token becomes the release token of the equivalent of Phase 4, and a migration procedure backfills partial claims for historical maturation. In practice the difficulty lies in reconstructing the attestation record; projects without structured attestation history cannot be staged retroactively.

The author's earlier prototype, *DeFarm Value Chain* (2025), implemented a simpler custody-transfer model on Soroban with provenance events, item history, and smart-contract custody. That work established the primitives for identity and event-driven state transitions that the staged model builds on; what the present note adds is the explicit partitioning of issuance across the asset lifecycle and the decomposition of oracle responsibility across phases.

The longer-term implication is that tokenization platforms for agricultural assets should offer the staged model as a primitive, not as an application. A platform that treats issuance as instantaneous is a financial platform wearing agricultural clothing; a platform that treats issuance as a staged lifecycle is one that has internalized the temporal topology of the real asset.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We have described a staged tokenization model in which agricultural asset issuance unfolds across five phases (origin, maturation, attestation, release, settlement), each with a distinct primary artifact and distinct oracle responsibility. The model solves cash-flow misalignment between producers and financiers, decomposes oracle risk into specialized roles, and aligns attestation incentives with asset outcome through staked collateral.

Several questions remain open. The calibration of phase cadence for specific asset classes (dairy, coffee, carbon) requires empirical grounding. The legal classification of partial claims under civil-law regimes that distinguish between physical commodities and securities is non-trivial. The interaction between staged tokenization and receivable-based financial instruments warrants a dedicated study. Each of these is a research program of its own.

We present this note as a foundation, not a conclusion. The test of the model is whether it makes tokenization projects cheaper to operate, more honest about lifecycle, and safer for the parties that carry the actual biological risk. Those are empirical questions, and we invite implementations that answer them.

Selected References

- Rondon, G. B. *DeFarm Value Chain: decentralized agricultural supply chain on Soroban* (2025). Source: `https://github.com/defarm-repo/soroban-value-chain`
- Stellar Development Foundation. *Soroban smart contract platform documentation.* `https://stellar.org/soroban`
- GS1. *EPCIS 2.0 standard: capturing and sharing supply chain visibility events.* GS1, 2022.
- Buterin, V. *On the difficulty of tokenizing illiquid real-world assets.* ethresear.ch, 2023.
- Pyth Network. *Pull-based price oracles for asset-class coverage.* Technical documentation, 2024.

- World Bank. *Agricultural receivables financing: structure and limits.* 2021 review.